



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

his belief in this type of Christianity, he makes some notable criticisms. He distinctly modifies the dogmatic features of the traditional "evangelical" message so that its theology, as he sets it forth, is frankly liberalized. The notion of original depravity is pronounced untenable. The doctrine of penal satisfaction is condemned on moral grounds. Hostility to science and to biblical criticism is declared to be injurious to the evangelical cause. Narrow views of Christian activity are rebuked. In all this the author is doubtless voicing a widespread sentiment. This liberalizing inevitably results in considerable vagueness at points where the emotional values of old phrases do not exactly correspond to the content in the newer doctrine. In particular is this true in the contention that the Cross must signify an objective atonement. But if the substitutionary theory be rejected, one is driven to some form of "moral influence." Garvie's exposition here is somewhat labored.

The book will serve as a wholesome corrective to narrow evangelicalism; and it is for the historian of modern religious thought an interesting document embodying in a spirit of commendable frankness and reverence certain typical aspects of that liberalizing of orthodoxy which is an outstanding feature of modern Christianity.

G. B. S.

SCHOPENHAUER, ARTHUR. *The Basis of Morality*. Translated with Introduction and Notes by A. B. BULLOCK. New York: Macmillan, 1915. xxviii+288 pages. \$1.25.

In 1837 the Danish Royal Society of Sciences propounded, as subject for a prize essay competition, the question, "Is the fountain and basis of morals to be sought for in conscience or in some other source of knowledge?" Schopenhauer was the only candidate, but his essay was rejected, probably because of its unorthodox character, Hegel and Fichte being the philosophical vogue of that period. The essay was published by the author in 1840 and in a second edition in 1860. It appeared in an English translation in 1902 and in a second edition in 1915. The theory of the essay is that the motive of compassion or sympathy (*Mitleid*) is the source of all morality, and the metaphysical sanction of sympathy is found in the Kantian doctrine of the phenomenal and noumenal worlds. The noumenal Reality "individuates" itself in the phenomenal order under the "forms" of time and space and causality. The noumenal Reality is the One. Its phenomenal self-expression is the Many. In ethical terms this many-ness shows itself in the multiplicity of egoistic lives, and this strife of wills is the occasion of life's innumerable immoralities. But the motive of sympathy tends to reveal the underlying oneness of life, and to overcome its tragic many-ness. In this theory Schopenhauer appeals not only to Kant but also to the ancient wisdom of oriental mysticism.

While today, of course, Schopenhauer's thought appears rationalistic to a degree, yet one cannot withhold admiration for the bold and independent spirit of this essay and the brilliance of its style. Psychology has thrown so much light upon the old egoistic-altruistic issue that it will no longer bear the weight of a metaphysical construction, yet in the middle of the last century this contribution of Schopenhauer was sufficiently original and suggestive to merit something better than the condemnation which the Danish Royal Society meted out to it.

A. C. W.